

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	ED CV 17-1164 PA (SPx)	Date	June 16, 2017
Title	Cynthia Gonzales v. Shamrock Foods Company, et al.		

Present: The Honorable		PERCY ANDERSON, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
V.R. Vallery	Not Reported		N/A
Deputy Clerk	Court Reporter		Tape No.
Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:		Attorneys Present for Defendants:	
None		None	

Proceedings: IN CHAMBERS - COURT ORDER

Before the Court is a Notice of Removal filed by defendant Shamrock Food Company ("Defendant"). In its Notice of Removal, Defendant asserts that this Court has jurisdiction over the action brought against it by plaintiff Cynthia Gonzales ("Plaintiff") based on the Court's diversity jurisdiction. See 28 U.S.C. § 1332.

Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction, having subject matter jurisdiction only over matters authorized by the Constitution and Congress. See, e.g., Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co., 511 U.S. 375, 377, 114 S. Ct. 1673, 1675, 128 L. Ed. 2d 391 (1994). A suit filed in state court may be removed to federal court if the federal court would have had original jurisdiction over the suit. 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a). A removed action must be remanded to state court if the federal court lacks subject matter jurisdiction. 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c). "The burden of establishing federal jurisdiction is on the party seeking removal, and the removal statute is strictly construed against removal jurisdiction." Prize Frize, Inc. v. Matrix (U.S.) Inc., 167 F.3d 1261, 1265 (9th Cir. 1999). "Federal jurisdiction must be rejected if there is any doubt as to the right of removal in the first instance." Gaus v. Miles, Inc., 980 F.2d 564, 566 (9th Cir. 1992).

In attempting to invoke this Court's diversity jurisdiction, Defendant must prove that there is complete diversity of citizenship between the parties and that the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. 28 U.S.C. § 1332. To establish citizenship for diversity purposes, a natural person must be a citizen of the United States and be domiciled in a particular state. Kantor v. Wellesley Galleries, Ltd., 704 F.2d 1088, 1090 (9th Cir. 1983). Persons are domiciled in the places they reside with the intent to remain or to which they intend to return. See Kanter v. Warner-Lambert Co., 265 F.3d 853, 857 (9th Cir. 2001). "A person residing in a given state is not necessarily domiciled there, and thus is not necessarily a citizen of that state." Id. For the purposes of diversity jurisdiction, a corporation is a citizen of any state where it is incorporated and of the state where it has its principal place of business. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(c); see also Indus. Tectonics, Inc. v. Aero Alloy, 912 F.2d 1090, 1092 (9th Cir. 1990).

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No. ED CV 17-1164 PA (SPx)

Date June 16, 2017

Title Cynthia Gonzales v. Shamrock Foods Company, et al.

In support of its allegations that the Court possesses diversity jurisdiction, the Notice of Removal alleges: “Plaintiff has alleged that she is a resident of the State of California. Complaint, ¶ 3. Additionally, Defendant’s personnel records reflect that during her employment with Defendant, Plaintiff claimed residency in California. Declaration of Debra Myers (“Myers Dec.”), ¶ 3. Plaintiff, therefore, was, at the time of the filing of the State Court Action, and remains, a citizen of California.” (Notice of Removal, ¶¶ 7-8.) As the Notice of Removal indicates, Plaintiff’s Complaint only alleges that Plaintiff “at all times relevant hereto, was and is a resident of the State of California.” (*Id.*, Ex. A, ¶ 3.) Therefore, both the Complaint and the Declaration of Debra Myers allege only Plaintiff’s residence. Because the only support for Defendant’s allegation of Plaintiff’s citizenship is an allegation of residence, and residence is not the same as citizenship, the Notice of Removal’s allegations are insufficient to establish Plaintiff’s citizenship. *Kanter*, 265 F.3d at 857 (“A person residing in a given state is not necessarily domiciled there, and thus is not necessarily a citizen of that state.”).

For all of the foregoing reasons, Defendant has failed to meet its burden to demonstrate the Court’s diversity jurisdiction. Accordingly, the Court remands this action to Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. RIC1709581. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c).

IT IS SO ORDERED.